

REMARKS

Applicant requests that the Examiner enter the amendments prior to examining the application. Claims 4 and 14 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1-2, 11-13, 15 and 24-25 have been amended to more clearly claim an aspect of the invention and do not constitute new matter.

Interview Summary

On July 24, 2007 a telephonic interview was held between Gero G. McClellan, attorney of record, and the assistant Examiner Nathan Hillery. The parties discussed the cited references including *Wiesehuegel et al.* (U.S. Publication 2002/0128949, hereinafter, "*Weisehuegel*") and *Keating* (U.S. Publication 2002/0052895). The parties also discussed proposed amendments to the independent claims. The proposed amendments are reflected in this amendment accompanying RCE.

During the interview, Applicants argued that *Wiesehuegel* do not disclose the limitations of utilizing "an XSL transform" without "setting values of variables within the application code." Further, Applicants argued that *Wiesehuegel* cannot be combined with *Keating* since doing so fundamentally alters the principle of operation of *Wiesehuegel*. An agreement was reached at the time of the interview that, with the amendments reflected herein, the prior art rejections of the §102 and §103 are overcome.

Regarding the art rejections under 35 USC § 102 and § 103:

As pointed out above, the parties agreed during the above-mentioned interview that the present amendments overcome the art rejections under 35 USC § 102 and § 103.

Regarding the §112 Rejection:

The Examiner suggests that there is no support for the limitation "without associating substituted functionality." The Examiner states in the continuation sheet

that “any negative limitation or exclusionary proviso must have basis in the original disclosure.” Applicants believe sufficient support is provided by the specification (since “disabling” elements necessarily means they are disassociated with any functionality; otherwise they would not be disabled). Nevertheless, Applicants have amended the claims and removed the limitation in order to move prosecution forward. Also, basis for the amended negative limitation, “without setting values of variables within the application code”, can be found in paragraph [0028] of the specification.

Additionally, regarding claims 2 and 12, the Examiner suggests that “if the functions are inaccessible, then the skilled artisan would be led to believe that the corresponding buttons will not be shown.” Although Applicants respectfully disagree, in the interest of moving prosecution forward, the claims have been amended with the term “unavailable” in order to clarify the invention.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants